

Agenda

May 6, 2019

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

100 Community Place, Side A, Crownsville, MD 21032

- Welcome of the Advisory Board – *Chair, Dr. George Arlotto*
 - Declaration of Quorum
 - Additions to the Agenda (if needed)
- Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes
 - April 8, 2019 - Meeting Minutes
- Maryland Center for School Safety Updates – *Kate Hession/Dino Pignataro*
- Work Plan Topic: Safe to Learn Grant FY20 – *MCSS*
 1. **Task:** Discuss the priority areas where the Safe to Learn grant funds could be focused.
 2. **Outcome:** Develop recommendations on notice of funding development for FY20 grants.
- Work Plan Topic: Transportation – *MCSS*
 1. **Task:** Discuss various pieces of school transportation safety.
 2. **Outcome:** Identify marketing strategies to improve transportation/bus safety in 2019-2020 school year.
- Closing – *Dr. Arlotto*
 - Next Meeting – July 1, 10:00 a.m. Anne Arundel County Public Schools Board Room, 2644 Riva Road, Annapolis MD 21401
 - Adjournment

Remaining 2019 Scheduled Meeting Dates

- June - NO MEETING
- July 1
- August – NO MEETING
- September 9
- October 7
- November 4
- December 2

Please be advised that the Advisory Board may move into a closed session, if needed, pursuant to Maryland Code, § 3-305 of the General Provisions Article.

Meeting Minutes - May 6, 2019

The meeting of the Maryland School Safety Advisory Board was held on May 6, 2019 at 100 Community Place, Crownsville, MD 21032

Dr. George Arlotto, the Advisory Board Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:09 a.m., and provided opening comments, noting that a quorum was present.

The following Advisory Board members were in attendance:

- Chair - Dr. George Arlotto, Superintendent, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
- Sheriff Scott Adams, Cecil County Sheriff's Office (Maryland Sheriff's Association)
- Thomas E. Alban, Director of Risk Management for the Archdiocese of Baltimore
- Dr. Kellie Anderson, Coordinator of Psychological Services, Anne Arundel County Public Schools
- Karin Bailey, Chair, St. Mary's County Board of Education (Maryland Association of Boards of Education)
- James T. Bell, Head Football Coach at Great Mills High School (Parent of a Public School Student)
- Dr. Chanta' M. Booker, Principal, New Era Academy (School Principal)
- Jon Carrier, SRO Anne Arundel County Public Schools (President, Maryland Association of School Resource Officers)
- Rachael Faulkner, Policy Consultant
- Pamela Gaddy (Maryland State Education Association / TABCCO)
- Captain Patrick D. Herring, Parent of a Child with Disabilities
- Laurel Moody, MS (Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems)
- Lourdes Padilla, Secretary Department of Human Services (MDHS)
- Manfred Reek, Representative School Bus Drivers
- Nicholas Shockney, Special Education Administrator, Carroll County Public Schools
- Lucas Tarbell, Student, Catonsville High School (Maryland Association of Student Councils)

The following Maryland Center for School Safety (MCSS) members were in attendance:

- Kate Hession, Executive Director
- Joseph Dino Pignataro, Deputy Director
- Dawn P. O'Croinin, Assistant Attorney General
- Christian Cymek, Special Assistant
- Holly Barrett, Certification and Education Administrator
- Ronald Pierce, Regional Specialist
- Emily Allen Lucht, Communication Specialist
- Sandra Caldwell, School Safety Analyst
- Jeyan Jabaraj, Data and Policy Analyst
- Jesika McNeil, Executive Assistant

Other meeting attendees:

- Zachary Hands, Special Projects Assistant to the State Superintendent of Schools

Other representatives of State agencies were also in attendance.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes:

A motion was made by Dr. Arlotto to approve the minutes. The motion to approve the April minutes passed unanimously and adopted with no changes.

Dr. Arlotto asked if there were any changes or deletions to the Agenda. There were none, Secretary Padilla moved in favor to approve the agenda.

Dr. Arlotto thanked Lucus Tarbell for his time as the Boards student member, acknowledging that this would be his last meeting.

Lucus Tarbell thanked each person on the Advisory Board for all of their support and interest in what the students of Maryland had to say and allowing him to have a voice.

Maryland Center for School Safety (MCSS) Updates:

MCSS Executive Director Kate Hession informed the Advisory Board that everyone was now in place at the Center and that the Center was in the process of getting its second office space at Bowie State University. Ms. Hession introduced Jeyan Jabaraj as the Center's most recent hire as the new data analyst.

Ms. Hession informed the Board that the second deployment of the School Resource Officer (SRO) Training in Montgomery County would be taking place as another group of 40 students to train-the-trainers that will help the Center through the remainder of the summer training close to 1,000 additional SROs.

Mr. Pignataro notified the Advisory Board that he was working hand-in-hand with Bowie State to get the second location up and running and that once they were done with graduation he hoped to begin moving into the space.

Work Plan 1: Safe to Learn Grant FY20:

Ms. Hession confirmed that the Center will be offering four grant Notice of Funding Availability (NOFAs) for Fiscal Year 2020 (FY20) that will be released on July 1st. The purpose of this discussion would be to discuss the draft NOFAs and receive comments and input from the board. Ms. Hession stated that there were certain items that must be included in the NOFAs as dictated by law and there are other things that the Board/Center has flexibility and those are the items that the Center is looking for the Boards input on.

Ms. Hession further stated that the Center would be presenting the NOFAs and the Board's input to the Subcabinet on May 20th. Ms. Hession stated that the grants would be presented in the following order: Hate Crimes, School Traffic Safety, SRO/Adequate Coverage, and finally the Safe School Funds.

Ms. Holly Barrett presented the Hate Crimes grant to the Board. Ms. Barrett informed the board that this would be the second year that the grant would be available and that the grant was originally earmarked at \$1 million dollars; however, for FY20 the grant would be funded at \$2 million dollars. Ms. Barrett informed the Board that last year there were 34 applicants for the grant of which 28 were awarded and funded. Ms. Barrett stated when prioritizing the FY19 funding, the Center first looked at public security, then training, then what help cameras could have provided at the time and finally technology, which is most expensive but has a short shelf life and finally a catch all. In order to judge the applications the Center reached out to Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) and used a format similar to theirs to rate and prioritize applications.

Ms. Barrett stated that in FY20, grants will require applicants to submit a C-1-25 (budget form) and a detailed project description. Ms. Barrett also noted that indirect costs will not be allowed and the applicants will have to delineate what the fixed costs are, and provide supporting documentation. Additionally, hourly rates for law enforcement support will be capped at \$50 per hour.

Ms. Barrett further informed the Board that this grant will be advertised on the Center website and sent out through our various partners including the Maryland State Department of Education. Ms. Barrett opened the floor for questions.

O'Croinin stated that the Attorney General's office will be hosting a listening conference in June with community leaders where she plans on informing them of the Hate Crimes grant as well. Additionally, O'Croinin stated that Maryland Coordination and Analysis Center (MCAC) has agreed to talk about what

a “Hate Crime” is during our workshops and that this has been included in the Center’s SRO training as well.

Dr. Arlotto stated that a newsletter goes out every Friday from Dr. Salmon to the Local School System Superintendents and that this may be another avenue to get the word out about the Hate Crimes grant.

Mr. Hands stated that Dr. Salmon’s office is planning to send out a letter about all of the grants to the local Superintendents.

Mr. Golden asked Ms. O’Croinin if she knew the date for the Attorney Generals notice.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that there’s a newsletter being sent out, but she would keep the group advised.

Ms. Hession informed the board that there were two outstanding questions regarding the Hate Crimes Grant. First: application timing. Last year the notice went out in October and closed in December. This year the notice will go out on July 1st and close in September, to give everyone time to review, apply and give the entities time to spend the money. Ms. Hession asked if the Board had any concerns about the proposed timeframe/deadline.

Dr. Arlotto stated that he believes that if the Center gets the information out now, it will give the school systems time to talk with their teams and apply.

Question: Dr. Arlotto: Is there any thought to any of the monies being used in soft areas vs. all hard areas, such as Anne Arundel County trying to get out in the community and doing outreach with staff, understanding the differences between the two types of costs. Can any money be spent on these types of efforts?

Ms. O’Croinin stated yes, the statute states that the monies can be spent on training but does not specify the type of training, so if it fits within the statute it’s allowable.

Ms. Bailey stated that she believed the grant should be more specific that the money could be used for and that it reads more to SROs and not so much to community outreach so she felt that specific wording would be more beneficial.

Ms. Hession stated that the grant has limited dollar amounts where the average was about \$25 thousand per applicant with \$2.1 million in requests with only \$1 million to distribute last year.

Ms. Barrett informed the Board that those that applied last year and did receive funding will not have priority this year and that new applicants will be given priority.

Ms. Hession posted the second question to the Board. Should the award amount be a specific dollar amount for the allocation?

Ms. O’Croinin stated that the way the notice is currently written it does not meet the statues requirements, therefore, the way it was done last year by ranking was better.

Secretary Padilla questioned if there was a way to partner with other department agencies that could bring additional funds and use that amount to allow more funding since there are others working on similar issues.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that the way the funds were appropriated, they were directly to the Maryland Center for School Safety to manage; however, it is something to think about in the future to see if there is a way to do a blended allocation.

Ms. Barrett presented the School Traffic Safety Grant to the Board.

Barrett informed the Board that only law enforcement agencies will be allowed to apply for this grant. The Center would like for the local school system and the law enforcement agencies in a jurisdiction, to work together to determine the needs for pedestrian safety, school bus safety, traffic enforcement needs and other innovative ideas. Barrett further informed the board that in 2008 GOCCP had this fund and officers went out on overtime to follow school buses. Last year, all law enforcement had to go through the local school systems for these funds which caused a lot of headaches, so the Center is trying to rectify that this year.

Ms. Barrett stated that fixed costs would be allowed this year and there would be the same sort of reporting as previous years (i.e., number of stops, citations issued, warnings issued, pedestrians stopped, and collisions involving school buses). As a baseline, the Center will be asking for documentation and statistics from each of the agencies. Ms. Barrett further stated that application prioritization will be focusing on safety on and around school buses, school bus stops, and pedestrian incidents.

The Center will require quarterly reporting and the Center will use a ranking system similar to the Hate Crimes Grant. The total grant dollar available statewide is \$600 thousand.

Mr. Tarbell posed the question if the funding could also help with speed cameras and cameras on buses to catch cars that pass the pass the buses when stopped.

Ms. Barrett stated that she was not sure but she would find out.

Mr. Pignataro stated that school cameras are handled by the local jurisdictions and considered a civil fine when issued.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that was correct that it was a civil fine, so it may not be eligible.

Manfred Reek stated that cameras on the buses to catch those running the bus signals would be great.

Ms. Faulkner asked if Montgomery County already had buses with cameras installed.

Ms. Hession responded yes.

Ms. Barrett stated that the language of the Safe Schools fund would include some public safety items such as buses and cameras.

Ms. Hession posed the question if anyone thought that making law enforcement eligible to apply for this grant would cause any questions.

Sheriff Adams stated that last year it was a problem for law enforcement and he felt that separating it back out for law enforcement to apply would be a good thing for both law enforcement and the school systems.

Mr. Pignataro stated that the schools did not want the responsibility of overseeing this grant for law enforcement.

Ms. Barrett questioned what was the Board thought would be the best way to get the word out.

Sheriff Adams stated that he had a board meeting coming up and he would share the information with all the Sherriff's and Chiefs and that a follow up letter would be great as well.

Ms. O'Croinin stated she would spread the word as well.

Ms. Hession presented the SRO and Adequate Coverage Grant to the Board.

Ms. Hession informed the Board that the grant would be made available to local school systems and law enforcement and the Center would be responsible to make sure that that applicants in each county do not exceed the statutory allocations. The Center provided guidelines for adequate coverage; however, it's up to the jurisdictions to determine what this means for them.

Ms. O'Croinin informed the Board that for FY19 applicants had to provide the Center information if they had adequate coverage and high schools and if not, what their plan was. This year (FY20) they will be required to report for every school, not just high schools. Additionally, Ms. O'Croinin reminded the board that SRO coverage is not required by law.

Ms. O'Croinin further informed the Board that each local school system is required to develop guidelines based on their needs by July 1st and this should be reflected in the numbers reported to the Center. Ms. O'Croinin is not sure if after-the-bell coverage and extra-curricular coverage is asked to be included in the plan but this has been under discussion and if not specified in this report it should be considered to be included down the road.

Ms. Hession informed the Board that this grant will require a lot of reporting and a lot of collaboration between the school systems and law enforcement.

Ms. O'Croinin stated that while local school systems can apply, there's a finite amount that can be allocated and that there's a ratio that is a fixed amount.

Ms. Hession asked the Board if there were any concerns.

Secretary Padilla asked for confirmation that this was only available to public school systems.

Ms. O'Croinin confirmed that this was the case.

Dr. Arlotto said that he was concerned that these funds were only good for a year, so it would be difficult for the school systems to hire people and put it on their books when they weren't sure if the funds would be there the following year to pay for them.

Ms. O'Croinin stated that the statute states that the funds were available as long as the law doesn't change. Therefore, the Center would have the funds and would allocate them proportionately but the amounts may change slightly based on the number of schools year-to-year.

Ms. Hession stated that this will be complicated for the Center to cross-check but it is in the statute that this is an annual funding.

Dr. Booker questioned that even though it's an annual funding, would the school systems have to apply each year and what would happen if you apply again and don't get the funds even though you thought the funds would be there again.

Ms. Hession stated that the money would be there and that the Center would be approving and reviewing all information submitted. Ms. Hession also stated that the application will set for the requirements to receive the funds.

Dr. Booker asked to clarify that once a school system has been approved will that approval and funds roll over year to year.

Ms. O'Croinin stated that the funds are always there, as long as the law doesn't change, and it's just a question of how much will be allocated.

Mr. Bell stated that when talking about after school events you have two buckets to consider. There are the special events and there are regular events, which are paid for differently. Mr. Bell further stated that there's regular funding for those people that are there till 5 PM but there are also people that are there for special events which funds may not be allocated for.

Ms. Hession asked if the recommendation would be that the Center collects this information as well.

Mr. Bell asked if the special events are being included in the after school events.

Ms. O'Croinin stated that this is part of determining what is considered adequate coverage because sometimes it is the schools vs. the community making the determination for these events. Ms. O'Croinin further stated that this is something the Center cannot determine, so the jurisdictions will need to include these events when outlining their needs, as it sets the tone for them going forward to get funding.

Mr. Pignataro stated that he thought we needed to be careful with this because if the school is using SRO coverage funding for those activities it will classify them as SROs and those individuals will be required to go through the training as well.

Ms. Bailey questioned if the report in July would be based on what is currently in place or what is ideal.

Ms. O'Croinin stated it would be based on what is ideal

Ms. Bailey questioned if these reports would be made public

Ms. O'Croinin stated that she would have to check and get back to the Board on if these reports would be public. (Follow-up: SRO plans and reports are not available to the public)

Ms. Bailey stated that if she submitted a report and then does not receive the funds and has an incident where that would leave the school system in regards to liabilities. Ms. Bailey further stated that her instinct is to say this is great but she questions if she is now opening herself up to liabilities.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that if there is an incident, they will come after you regardless of the report.

Ms. Bailey stated that yes that is true; however by providing the report she has identified holes that would provide them with more evidence.

Ms. O’Croinin informed Ms. Bailey that as long as the school systems followed the law it’s better to show that they did everything they were supposed to do and filled in the gaps as best you could.

Ms. Hession stated that the Center will double check the reports and numbers and if this information is made public. (Follow-up: SRO plans and reports are not available to the public)

Ms. O’Croinin stated that the Subcabinet has to determine a way to shield the grant applicants from public notice and when it can identify a school systems shortfalls.

Dr. Arlotto asked for clarification if the terms SRO and adequate coverage are being used synonymously.

Mr. Pignataro stated that legislators want a SRO in each school and knowing that this cannot happen they want adequate coverage at a minimum.

Dr. Arlotto stated that he thought that the after school programs may want to make their coverage personnel SROs

Ms. Faulkner stated that when Kirwan passed they addressed this same issued but used different language, so Ms. Faulkner suggested that the Center looks at the statute and see how coverage was being defined there to clean up the language.

Ms. Hession opened the floor for any additional questions or concerns on the SRO and adequate coverage grant.

Ms. Hession presented the final grant, the Safe Schools Funds Grant to the Board.

Ms. Hession stated that this is a \$10 million dollar grant with very specific allocation categories such as: Conducting trainings, training assessment teams etc. Ms. Hession also informed the Board that the allocation last year was \$200 thousand per school system off the top and then a per pupil base to determine total allocation. For FY20 the Center is considering the 24 local school systems as well as including non-public special facilities that take public students so that they can apply for the grants as well.

Ms. Hession informed the Board that even though there’s a per pupil amount the allocation amount would be minimal, so the recommendation is to offer an allotment per facility allowing them to have some dollars that they can put towards school safety to assist the public school students and supplement per pupil after that.

Ms. Hession opened the floor to thoughts, comments and concerns.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that there are approximately 94 schools, so giving a flat amount would help keep everyone equal. Ms. O’Croinin’s recommendation is to drop the allocation amount so that everyone gets a flat allocation and a per pupil allocation so that all schools are included.

Ms. Faulkner stated that the local school systems are paying for the pupils because they are the ones that determine that placement is needed and pay for those special needs.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that was somewhat correct because when you look at the actual numbers they don’t because that number isn’t provided to the public school system.

Ms. Hession stated that when talking about facility safety, the non-public facilities weren’t eligible for the safety evaluation grant last year and weren’t required to assess each of their schools.

Ms. Hession suggested that for now we forget how the funds are allocated and asked if the Board would support a recommendation to give at least some funds to these facilities.

Secretary Padilla stated that her answer was yes, she would support giving some funds to these facilities.

Dr. Arlotto confirmed that the answer was yes; however, some specificity for each Local Education Agency (LEA) and how the monies are going to the non-publics. Dr. Arlotto stated that the Board needs to figure out what portion of the funds go to the school systems and what portion goes to the non-public schools.

Ms. Hession suggested an allocation off the top for non-public schools and questioned if everyone would be okay with that and if so, what would be a reasonable amount of money for each facility? Ms. Hession clarified that she’s using the term facility because some have more than one location and asked what the Board thought would be a reasonable off-the-top amount.

Ms. Bailey stated that you have to evaluate each of the schools because you have institutions like Hopkins that have funds from other sources and while she agrees that some money has to these facilities, each will need to be evaluated because some are much larger than some of the smaller facilities that could use assistance

Mr. Shockney stated that the number of students that are being serviced at these facilities should also be considered.

Ms. Faulkner believes this is really complicated because some of the non-publics also service children from the District of Columbia and some of the students may be going to out of state facilities with Maryland dollars, so talking about the population would be tricky.

Mr. Shockney asked if the proposal is that the Board agrees to an off-the-top and per pupil allocation or one or the other?

Ms. Hession asked the Board what they thought was best because they made a good point regarding the size of the facility.

Ms. Moody asked that if you do a per pupil allocation wouldn’t that drill it down the allocation that it would be too low?

Ms. O’Croinin reported that the report that was reviewed was based on Maryland’s 24 counties, not the total enrollments of the schools themselves.

Ms. Hession stated that she as hearing from the Board that if the Center can figure out an allocation that will work, an off the top allotment would be reasonable in their mind, and the remaining amount of money should be a school system flat allocation or a per pupil allocation this year.

Ms. Hession gave the example of Kent County where if there was no flat allocation last year they would have only received \$50 thousand dollars vs. the \$230 thousand dollars they received.

Dr. Anderson stated that she was struggling with these questions and that she thought the allocations should consider how you get these people and schools that are furthest behind up to par with those schools that have made more strides.

Mr. Bell asked when you say “per student” are you considering the reduced lunch counts as well or not. Mr. Bell stated that he works in a school that is large; however, they have a lot of kids that needed additional assistance, so you may have a larger school that requires a lot of assistance.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that farm eligible locations are not included in the legislation as it is currently written. Ms. O’Croinin stated that this was a different metric and not part of the safety grant.

Mr. Golden stated that he needed clarity when you were talking about schools and asked if this is including all schools and the students assigned to these schools. Mr. Golden wanted to know if these are including all schools and the students assigned to these schools because their needs will vary and treatment will vary along with these needs. Mr. Golden also stated that if someone is identified as special needs they may be sent to a different county than the county receiving the funds.

Ms. O’Croinin stated that there were different things identified. That there would be a flat allocation per system plus a per pupil or that there will be a flat allocation and competitive applications for the remaining funds. Ms. O’Croinin also stated that there is another bucket with the non-public placement facilities and students serviced there may come from other jurisdictions.

Mr. Alban asked if there will be a fixed amount per student or will every county get a flat amount then a sliding scale where they would get less per pupil based off the amount they spend since the counties publish what they spend per school each year.

Ms. Bailey asked if the per pupil allotment would be based on state or federal depending on their needs so that the allotment is adjusted accordingly, Ms. Bailey stated that we have to be careful not to penalize those counties that are receiving more money from the county verses the state or federal government.

Dr. Arlotto stated that you also have to be sure to consider the wealth index.

Ms. Bailey stated that if it's the Center's goal to bring everyone up to par that now that there has been a year of funding it makes sense to look at all the school systems and see where they are and who needs the most assistance so that those that are further ahead aren't using the funds to get even further ahead than those that are lagging behind.

Ms. Hession asked if Ms. Bailey was suggesting a fully competitive application process.

Ms. Bailey stated that if the goal is to protect all students that she did not believe that the per pupil allocation was the best way to accomplish this,

Ms. Hession stated that the problem with a fully competitive application process is that the areas that need the most help are the ones that also need the most help writing their grant applications and that she did not think that they have the ability to competitively bid to get the funds.

Dr. Booker stated that she believed a competitive process would be more valuable, even if it was pushed to next year, because the funding should be based off needs. Dr. Booker asked if some of the funding could be used for training on grant writing so that it's a level field for everyone. Dr. Booker stated that she believed getting everyone to the same level by offering training would be beneficial.

Ms. Hession stated that she thought that the Centers grant information and training this year would provide a stepping stone in that direction.

Ms. Faulkner asked if the discussion was about approximately \$11 per student for the non-public schools and that this per pupil allotment would be very little to the schools so how would they be of help.

Ms. Hession stated that this was her concern as well which is why a flat amount and then an allocation so that everyone would receive a reasonable amount of money.

Ms. Faulkner asked if that would be competitive.

Ms. Hession stated that it would not be a competitive grant for this year because there would not be enough time for this to be feasible.

Ms. Faulkner stated that would mean that the public school jurisdictions would get less.

Ms. Hession stated that for next year the Center would look at making the grant competitive and for this year the Center would look at an off-the-top allocation.

Ms. Bailey asked if the Center would consider the size of the facility to determine what the off-the-top allocation would be and then allocate the remainder down.

Mr. Cymek suggested breaking off a portion of the funds and having it go to all of the non-publics and then making the remaining funds competitive.

Ms. O'Croinin stated that Mr. Cymek's suggestion would probably be the only way the Center would be able to understand their needs and this would be a way to determine that.

Ms. Hession stated that the Center would take all of the recommendations back to the Subcabinet.

Dr. Anderson asked if there were any other substantive changes to the grants or were they all as statute, Ms. Hession stated that they were all as statute and that the NOFAs would go out July 1st.

Work Plan 2: Transportation:

Ms. Allen-Lucht informed the Board that school bus safety week is October 21 – 25 and that she would like everyone to break into three groups to have discussion on what will be the Centers message and the best way to get it out. Group one will be to the kids, group two will be to the parent's, faculty and community and group three would be to the drivers.

Ms. Allen-Lucht asked everyone what they have or have not seen in regards to bus safety.

Ms. O'Croinin suggested sharing messages in commuter lounges at colleges and universities.

Ms. McNeil suggested public messages playing in the grocery stores while parents are shopping.

Ms. Bailey suggested having messages play at the gas pumps when someone is filling their cars.

Dr. Booker suggested kiosks and billboards at schools.

Sheriff Adams suggested having messages play at the movie theaters.

Ms. Faulkner suggested having messages play at the MVA because you only learn about bus laws when you initially get your driver's license.

Secretary Padilla suggested messages at the local driving schools.

Mr. Golden suggested that we ask the high schools to reinforce the message during the morning announcements.

Mr. Jabaraj asked if the Center had any private partnerships that could reinforce the message.

Ms. Allen-Lucht stated that the Center has a relationship with Clear Channel.

Ms. Caldwell suggested that the Center place signs on the back of the school buses outlining the fine if you pass a school bus that is stopped.

Dr. Booker suggested that you push notifications during certain times through the schools apps if they have them.

Group 1 after reviewing the information stated that everyone is invested in bus safety and suggested that the Center look at all factors not just the students.

Group 2 stated that they were not clear themselves on the law and that you could report someone. They believed that the lack of information and bus rules were the problem and that they were not sure if the impact from the law was sufficient by reaching the "pain points"

Group 3 suggested that there should be a course that drivers have to take and that the first time you are stopped you get a warning, the second time your stopped you have to take a three hour course on school safety or community service, like if you're caught drinking.

Ms. Allen-Lucht asked the Board if they knew of any other entities that they thought the Center should work with on bus safety.

Ms. Hession informed the Board that the Center will be looking for volunteers to record its PSAs

Mr. Shockney made a suggestion that the Center should have the kids tell the story as to why school bus safety is important.

Mr. Jabaraj stated that education is critical and that the message should be reinforced as to when to stop for a school bus and amplify the message around the fines.

Ms. Hession stated that the Center would sit down with the MVA to talk about getting the messages out with the new licenses being issued.

Ms. Allen-Lucht stated that the Center will work with local law enforcement and identify different state programs that have made an impact.

Closing:

Dr. Arlotto thanked everyone for the conversation and reminded the Board that there would be no meeting in June.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Mr. Alban, which was seconded by Secretary Padilla and Ms. Faulkner the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting concluded at 12:05 pm.